

**Translake Workshop-TDM Discussion is Needed-** So far the TDM element of the Translake Phase 2 multi-modal EIS options study appear to have less emphasis than what was recommended by Translake Phase 1. It also assumes that they are the same TDM/GMA program for any option, from No-Action- 4-lane 58' wide option to the widest 190'-10 lane option with provision for 2HCT/6 SOV/2HOV. The TDM program element should vary with the option. There is a greater need for an effective TDM/GMA trip reduction program/agreements for those Translake options that do not include expansion of any SOV capacity. The predictability and effectiveness of a successful corridor management partnership agreement is extremely important

**Current Problems:**

1. So far the Translake TDM staff work has primarily been drawn from the I-405 Corridor study and from CTR programs, which are limited. The non-commute trips are at least 75% of the overall trips and effective TDM-related options for non-commute trips need more emphasis.
2. Translake transportation corridor planners and existing consultants have a limited range of professional background experience in developing TDM and growth management agreements. They have not sought working with local cities and counties and additional expertise to help guide us through this important aspect of the project.
3. It was agreed that the PSRC TDM Roundtable group would be resource and advisory to the corridor study process. That relationship has **not** been established and needs to be started as soon as possible.
4. So far pricing has **not** received significant emphasis as part of the range of options.
5. Before the final range of EIS options are adopted in June 2001 or July, it is important that staff work on developing and presenting the estimated effectiveness of various TDM options/strategies for each multi-modal alternative.

**Background**

One of the conclusions of the Phase 1 of the Translake study recommended a new linkage between land use and transportation decisions as part of a major Translake Corridor (SR 520/I-90) upgrade. It recommended that "the TDM Roundtable be convened by PSRC to start an early focus on funding, strengthening and coordination of TDM programs". In parallel with Translake's Phase 2 EIS preparation, this cooperative community program would provide a challenging and unique opportunity to move beyond short-term capacity and mobility problem-solving, to interconnecting sustainable future community land use and economic actions with transportation policies, and decisions along this important east-west cross-lake sub-regional corridor.

In January 2000 WSDOT applied for a \$875,000 federal ISTEA Transportation Community and System Preservation (TCSP) grant to further this effort. As of the first week in August 2000, the U.S House has acted and approved a \$430,000 grant. 1000 Friends of Washington, WSDOT and Sound Transit lobbied successfully the U.S. House and Senate and the resulting joint Conference Committee to approve the original requested amount after their 2000 Labor Day recess. Washington state and the Puget Sound region have a strong commitment to managing growth and the reduction of trips to maintain vibrant communities and a healthy economy. The Puget Sound Regional Council's Vision 2000 and 2030 Metropolitan Transportation Plan mirror many of the T-21 Community Preservation grant objectives and other federal programs to improve and enhance communities.

The grant was important to provide additional non-earmarked funding for improving the TDM/GMA aspects of the study.

In Translake's Phase 1 Final Report one of the conclusions stated was that "land use and transportation systems are not integrated in their planning and implementation". With local governments required to adopt updates of their local growth management plans by 2002, the timing allows for inter-local coordination at the a corridor level between the local jurisdictions and major private interests adjacent to it. Lead time is important in aggressively moving ahead on this element so that local planning agencies can include TDM planning for Translake in their update work plans. The

basic challenge is building a community-building process to shape new outcomes through land use and transportation decisions.

### **Next Steps**

How to do it? There are very few existing models for this of corridor effort. Most current U.S model corridor agreements have been developed in the aftermath of litigation, years of inaction and driven by a conflict resolution process between multiple jurisdictions. (Example-Paris Pike Agreement, Kentucky) In rural corridor areas one agency manages coordinates long-term efforts for a selected scenic or parkway corridor. One local model, the local “Mountains to Sound Green-way” I-90 Corridor group has a 70 person Board that meets regular for dinner meetings in Preston and sends out newsletters to update its constituents.

**The objective** is to invent the unique Translake Corridor Management Partnership with public and private corridor interests probably using the existing structure that has been developed for the Phase 2, EIS analysis. Local governments include: Beaux Arts, Bellevue, Clyde Hill, Hunts Point, Yarrow Point, King County, Kirkland, Mercer Island, Redmond, Seattle, Sound Transit, Metro and the Puget Sound Regional Council along with major local private interests located along the corridor. Through local and corridor plans and actions the partners will work together to reduce environmental impacts, preserve communities and improve system efficiency by through programs to encourage the use of alternative transportation modes, pedestrian/transit oriented development and transportation demand management actions to reduce single occupant vehicle trips. .

### **Outcome of Work**

Proposed “Inter-local Corridor Partnership” Agreements should include trip reduction goals with milestones, monitoring plans and funding plans” as well as an institutional decision-making process that permits changes to alter and improve upon previously agreed upon plans. The partnership would include representatives of the original stakeholders along with a provision for changes. Long-term agreements are difficult to modify without an agreed upon mediation or conflict resolution process.

The Translake advisory group will rely upon the program’s staff research on the DEIS TDM/GMA alternatives and the local cities, counties and businesses to provide the information and analysis for the consideration of alternative outcomes through—

1. Review and inventorying existing city and county TDM policies and complementary growth management programs of cities and corridor adjacent businesses.
2. Supplemental joint community discussions on growth management plan updates,
3. Alternative visioning presentations,
4. Cooperative sharing of EIS information and analysis and the PSRC TDM Roundtable corridor recommendations,
5. Developing preferences for actions that will become integral to the local planning and permitting policies and transit projects and programs, to implement a unified corridor vision, that are complementary to the final recommendations for the Translake SR 520/I-90 projects.
7. From this information and work a draft agreement would be crafted for implementing the corridor strategy based upon committed actions and funding from all of the involved parties.
8. This agreement should be reviewed by an independent group of national TDM experts for suggestions and improvements, before the final agreement is adopted.
9. Develop a coordinated public education and pre-and post construction TDM strategy and reporting system joint program, to reduce the impact transition construction impacts on communities, users and employers during and after the Translake construction phase.

Suggested Resource People: Jim Ellis, Green-way Project; Dan Carlson, U of W Public Affairs; Peter Calthorpe, Berkley California; Peter Katz, Power-point Visioning, San Francisco, Sam Zimmerman, Parsons Brinkerhoff, Portland, Oregon.